

Just Another Item on The Moral Issue in This Presidential Campaign

"In the meantime it was learned that Mr. Goldwater felt a light-hearted tolerance about a political embarrassment of his own. This was the charge that John Grenier, executive director of the Republican National Committee, had paid \$1,000 to a Democratic Party employee to steal confidential messages and information.

"The source said that Mr. Goldwater said that, frankly, he thought the culprit was the one who would take the money, that it was not a case of Mr. Grenier's being guilty

but the other fellow.

"Mr. Goldwater, who picked Mr. Grenier for the No. 2 post at the national committee, has not spoken with him about the bribe charge, the source said. The source said that Mr. Goldwater would not have paid such a bribe himself—because he thought it would have been possible to get the wanted intelligence on the Democratic Party for nothing."

—New York Times, (Late City ed.) p. 22, Oct. 16.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XII, NO. 36

OCTOBER 26, 1964



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

In Which We Nominate Nikita for the Nobel Peace Prize

Before Khrushchev passes from the stage, he more than any man on earth deserves the Nobel peace prize. It should not be forgotten that in the world's first nuclear confrontation, it was Nikita Sergeyevitch Khrushchev who did what so very few leaders have been willing to do in comparable situations, and that is to risk his power by climbing down for the sake of peace. The other day Robert F. Kennedy told a gathering of nuns that his brother decided against a direct air strike on Cuba's missile bases because this might have cost 25,000 lives; this was put forward as an example of humanity. But the escalation President Kennedy invited in insisting on the Russian backdown and withdrawal, risked easily 25,000,000 lives. If Khrushchev had not given in, if the mushroom clouds had begun to rise around our planet, would the survivors have thought Kennedy justified in destroying so many human lives rather than negotiating peacefully? Or even accepting on this side of the world the kind of bristling nuclear bases with which we had surrounded Russia on the other? To accept the Russian missiles in Cuba might have cost Kennedy his political future. To have accepted the U.S. ultimatum might have cost Khrushchev his. It was Khrushchev who paid the price for peace.

The Clue to K's Removal

On the other hand, the Cuban missile affair demonstrated that streak of impulsiveness which may hold the clue to Khrushchev's removal. Those missiles, an all too easy target in the event of war, would not have made a decisive difference in the horrible arithmetic of Soviet-American deterrence. It was not worth the cost in undermining relations between Moscow and Washington; it was rash and ill-considered, as light-headed in its way as Khrushchev's sudden call for *troika* leadership of the United Nations. In this perspective, it is easy to see that younger men, though devoted to the same general principles, might easily decide that Khrushchev's leadership had become a menace and a liability. But before he goes, one ought also to remember his other historic contributions, especially the 20th Congress "secret speech" forever destroying the mythology of Stalinism, and his signature of the limited nuclear test ban on American terms. It was this which cleared the skies of fallout, at the price of accepting

SANE Words on That Chinese Bomb

"Keeping a doctrinaire and nuclear-armed country in a state of semi-isolation endangers world security. We urge immediate efforts by the U.S., Great Britain, the USSR and the 105 other signers of the nuclear test ban treaty to bring China and France to accept its provisions, and to extend the treaty to underground tests as well. In addition the U.S. should press for China's inclusion in disarmament negotiations. China would begin to take part in the world community. China and the U.S., now limited to occasional contacts through their ambassadors in Warsaw, would have an additional channel of communication. Additional steps by the U.S. which in time would encourage moderation by the Chinese leaders: 1. Negotiate the exchange of journalists. 2. Exchange of scientists and scholars between China and the U.S. 3. Removal of restrictions on trade in non-strategic goods. 4. Offer of surplus food for sale in case of agricultural shortages in China. 5. Encouragement to non-governmental organizations to sponsor informal meetings with their Chinese counterparts."

—Dr. Benj. Spock, co-chairman of SANE, Oct. 16 (abr.)

U.S. superiority and U.S. continuation of underground testing. We—let us speak honestly—gave nothing. On the contrary Khrushchev's fall may be linked to our continued "tough" policy: 36 announced underground tests since the treaty was signed, the campaign for an MLF force with a German finger on the nuclear trigger, and our new moves to expel Russia from the UN unless it pays up assessments which the French, too, oppose as contrary to the UN charter. These are hardly contributions to peace nor advertisements for Khrushchev's policy of "peaceful co-existence."

One hopes for the sake of the Soviet peoples and world stability that the new leadership will move toward a more civilized and constitutional method for change. They got rid of Khrushchev, as he got rid of Malenkov and later of the "anti-party" group, in palace intrigue fashion. Neither the people nor even the party are told the real issues; the other side is never allowed to explain its case; in the placid streets the people go about their business, politically inert, as if theirs

(Continued on Page Four)

Kennedy Interview on Meet the Press Shows Need to Challenge Him on Foreign Policy

Bobby Cites Vietnamese War As No. 1 Benefit of Federal Spending

We were struck by a recurrent phrase which cropped up in Robert F. Kennedy's appearance last Sunday on *Meet the Press*. At one point in explaining his qualifications for the Senatorship, Mr. Kennedy said he had been involved in matters which "intimately affect the State of New York, whether it be *the question of survival* [our italics] or whether it be domestic matters." At another point, when asked about his ultimate objective, he said "I think first and most important is the question of survival."

Survival, Not Peace?

The phrasing is curious. He did not say the question of peace but of survival. A related glimpse into his thinking was provided when he was asked about his loss of temper with a young man heckling him about Federal spending. "I explained," Mr. Kennedy said, "the great things that were being done by the Federal government and by others for him. There were people who were fighting in Vietnam, there were people who were fighting, standing on the wall of Berlin, there were those who had been ready to invade Cuba. . . ."

Mr. Kennedy put the Vietnamese war, the Berlin wall and the readiness to invade Cuba first on his list of the benefits that young man derived from Federal spending. This was the answer of a man taken up with war, hot and cold. I would guess that when Mr. Kennedy talks about the "question of survival" he means finding a way to win that war, and that he thinks of it as an unlimited struggle, in which one is prepared, as in the missile crisis, to stake everything on the outcome.

In trying to establish his experience in foreign policy, Mr. Kennedy did not mention any of the peaceful accomplishments of his brother's administration, such as the test ban. He cited his service as chairman of a "Committee on Guerrilla Warfare." This was a new disclosure, but no one asked him how he thought we were doing against guerrilla warfare in Vietnam. It is a pity there is no pro-peace candidate in

Bobby Disapproved of McCarthy?

Mr. [Edwin] Newman (NBC News): In short you disapproved of Senator McCarthy's conduct, did you?

Mr. Robert F. Kennedy: Yes, in the operation of the committee.

—On *Meet the Press*, Oct. 18.

"Robert Kennedy remembers that when he met Joe McCarthy for the first time at the University [of Virginia], 'I liked him almost immediately.' The feeling was mutual and it was one that did not change. . . ."

—Robert F. Kennedy: *The Brother Within*, a biography by Thompson and Myers, published in 1962, boosting Bobby for President in 1968.

"... not only was Bobby a legal counsel to Senator Joseph R. McCarthy's committee, but he would have remained quite happily on the subcommittee if he had not run afoul of another young-man-on-the-make, Roy Cohn. As it is, Joe McCarthy was a close personal friend and his loyalty to Joe's memory continues.

"Lately, Bobby has spent a good deal of time promoting the movie of *The Enemy Within*. He decided he wanted Paul Newman to play the part of himself as counsel to the McClellan committee. Newman declined. Bobby asked to meet him face to face. . . . The conversation was amiable until Bobby asked Newman what he was doing next. Newman said that he hoped to narrate a documentary about the late Senator McCarthy.

"Bobby snapped: 'You shouldn't allow your name to be associated with that.' Newman said: Why not? . . . Besides he [Newman] didn't like McCarthy. . . . Bobby exploded: Newman wasn't qualified to judge. He knew nothing about McCarthy. Newman said that he had followed McCarthy's career at the time; he had also read Richard Rovere's book on the subject. 'Well, Rovere didn't know anything about it either,' said Bobby."

—Gore Vidal in *Esquire*, March 1963.

the field to press him on this and on that "question of survival." Of all the blank spaces in the inane New York campaign, this one is the most disturbing.

What Kennedy Has Discreetly Forgotten About His Work on the McCarthy Committee

Mr. Newman: Mr. Kennedy, you were at one time connected with a Senate committee when Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin was on it, chairman of it, and that conceivably will cost you some votes in November. What precisely was your connection with that committee and how did it come about?

Mr. Kennedy: . . . I worked for Mr. [Francis] Flanagan [the ex-FBI man then general counsel to the McCarthy committee]. I was not involved in any of the so-called Communist investigations during that period of time. I was involved in matters such as the fact that the government purchased some palm oil and put it in tanks. . . . Momentous matters such as that.

—On *Meet the Press*, Oct. 18.

"... as Robert Kennedy recalls, McCarthy during December 1952 and January 1953, painted an impressive picture of the future he had in mind for the committee. . . . 'I felt the investigation of communism was an important domestic issue,' he (Kennedy) says. . . . His biggest job in that period was an investigation of East-West trade, that produced some startling results, including angry denunciations of young Kennedy by the British. . . . Investigator Kennedy said . . . that in the first three months of 1953,

while the Korean war was still flaming, 'an absolute minimum of' 162 Western vessels, 100 of which were British, did business with Red China. Then he added the real shocker: Two ships owned by the British firm of Wheelock-Marden had transported Chinese Communist troops. . . . McCarthy said: 'It seems unbelievable, unheard of . . . that a nation would have ships owned by its nationals transporting the troops to kill its own soldiers.'

—Robert F. Kennedy, by Thompson and Myers (1962).

These charges by Kennedy turned out to be a typical McCarthyite mish-mash. There were two ships involved. One was the *Perico*, owned by Wallem & Co. of Hong Kong. "The company said" (Facts on File, 178N, 1953) "the *Perico*'s captain took 462 unarmed, allegedly sick Reds and about 12 armed guards from Kwangchow to Canton June 22, 1951, because he was warned that 'somebody would be shot' if he refused. The other ship was the *Miramar*, owned by Wheelock-Marden under Panamanian registry. It came under Chinese Communist control in August 1951 and was used to transport troops to Shanghai in June 1952. The British Ambassador in Washington warned against using "such isolated and doubtful cases to cast aspersions" on British loyalty in the Korean war.

Goldwater's Finance Chairman Comes From One of The Nation's Largest Arms Contractors**Billionaire Families of DuPont and Mellon Are Quietly Backing Barry**

American business has not deserted the Republican Party's leading exponent of free enterprise so completely as is generally assumed. Billionaire families like the Du Ponts and the Mellons, for example, are conspicuously absent from the ranks of Johnson supporters. Although they aren't publicly endorsing Goldwater either, they have been helping him quietly. Lamont DuPont Copeland, president of E. I. DuPont de Nemours, and Pierre DuPont, its vice-president, were co-hosts at a Goldwater luncheon for businessmen this fall. The Mellons have been more subtle. They have been contributing to Goldwater through closely held corporations like Gulf Oil and Consolidated Coal. Gulf has given a fortune to right wing organizations which in turn support Goldwater (see box at right). It has also urged its employees to make campaign contributions. (*N. Y. Times*, Sept. 12). Consolidated Coal's vice-chairman, R. Livingston Ireland, appeared in the "Businessmen for Goldwater" ad in the *Wall Street Journal* (Oct. 1). So did Bennett Chapple Jr., a vice-president of U.S. Steel, also a Mellon-dominated enterprise. Another Mellon ploy is to offer support through the Scaife side of the family. (R. K. Mellon's daughter Sarah married a Scaife.) *Human Events* reported last fall that Raymond Scaife, R. K.'s nephew, was lining up behind Goldwater.

The Weapons Makers and the Utilities

The weapons merchants and the electric utilities have also been careful not to endorse Goldwater publicly. (With one or two exceptions they have not endorsed Johnson either.) This is understandable since one depends on government contracts and the other on government regulation. But Ralph Cordiner, recently retired chairman of General Electric, is chief fund-raiser for Goldwater. GE gets most of the subcontracts for electrical work on armaments and makes more profit from armament than any other U.S. firm (over \$100 million annually). Another major Goldwater supporter with ties into the Pentagon and big business is the American Security Council (see box below). The clearest public expression of electric utility support for Goldwater has come from a trade journal, *Electrical World*. It commented shortly after the Re-

Big Business and the Radical Right

"A total of 113 industrial, mercantile, and banking firms, and twenty-five electric and gas companies have been identified as having contributed in the last few years to organizations of the American Right Wing. . . . Broadly speaking, oil, steel, and heavy machinery producers, and manufacturers of motors and motor controls, tend to predominate. . . . So do chemical and textile companies. The names of electric, gas, and power companies in various sections of the country appear as contributors with noticeable frequency.

"Harding College and the National Education Program located on its campus have received corporate contributions that total hundreds of thousands of dollars over the years. The Republic and United States Steel corporations, as well as Gulf and Humble Oil companies were among the major corporate contributors." —Forster and Epstein, *Danger on the Right*

publican convention (Aug. 10) that "present restraints on the investor-owned electric utility industry would be relaxed in the wake of November Republican victory." Besides their contributions to right-wing groups, which have been voluminous, the utilities are supporting Goldwater quietly by means of retainer fees. These are paid to a large number of lawyers, advertising agencies and engineering firms with the understanding that a substantial portion of the fee must go to a designated candidate or political organization. The utilities then write off the fees as operating expense.

Also backing Goldwater are several insurance companies who don't like social security and don't want medicare. The Hazard (Kentucky) Coal Operators Assn., is pro-Goldwater; both oppose the Appalachian Development Program. But the big monopolies support him for a larger reason. A good Goldwater showing in November would shift the whole spectrum of American politics further to the right and away from any tendency toward "socialist" planning. This is also why corporations supply a large part of the \$25 million which is poured annually into crackpot groups on the far right. These zany now appear weekly on over 7000 separate radio and TV programs.

"Businessmen For Goldwater" Draws Support From Industrial Witch-Hunters

McCarthyism may be out of fashion for the moment in government, but it is very much alive in industry. It flourishes there in the American Security Council, a rapidly growing tax-exempt corporation which operates a loyalty-security blacklist for employers. Its files, according to a Group Research special report, now contain the names of over 1,000,000 "subversives," and its annual operating budget is around a quarter of a million dollars. It was founded in 1955 by an ex-FBI agent and now has several more on its staff. Also on the staff is Karl Baarslag, a research director for McCarthy's Government Operations Committee and later a consultant for HUAC. Its field director is Cleon Skousen, who as Chief of Police in Salt Lake City was even too much for Mayor J. Bracken Lee, himself an ardent right-winger. In 1960 Lee fired Skousen as "an incipient Hitler."

Some of the most prominent members of "Businessmen for Goldwater" are also active in the Security Council. One Goldwater vice-chairman, Patrick Frawley (Chairman of

Schick Safety Razor) is a major fund-raiser for the Council. Another Goldwater vice-chairman, Bennet Archambault (chairman of Stewart-Warner) is on the Council's Senior Advisory Board. Other Goldwater businessmen on the Advisory Board are Robert Gavin (President of Motorola), General R. E. Wood (Director of Sears Roebuck), Wayne Johnston (President of Illinois Central Railroad), and F. K. Weyerhaeuser, (Chairman of Weyerhaeuser Co.).

Even without a like-minded spirit in the White House, the Security Council enjoys considerable influence. Representatives from U.S. Steel and General Electric are its vice-presidents. Many retired military officers are on its staff. When Secretary McNamara in 1962 appointed a citizens advisory committee to look into Senator Fulbright's complaint about military sponsorship of seminars on communism, one of the appointments was Frank Barnett, although he was himself a member of the Security Council and had been singled out by Fulbright as an organizer of the seminars!

The U.S. Still Does Not See the No. 1 Item on the Planetary Agenda

(Continued from Page One)

but to do and die. "The worst thing," Togliatti wrote in his testament only a few weeks before, "is first to give an impression that everything is always fine and then suddenly to be forced to talk about difficult situations and to explain them." Moscow lacks a mechanism for legitimacy; the murky and incestuous smoke-filled rooms of the Central Committee are a poor substitute. The Czars at least had primogeniture as a guide to the succession. Now there is only covert whispering in the corridors. Equally bad is the habit of building up the leader as a hero one day and a monster or fool the next; this must develop a quiet contempt for the party leadership among the thoughtful in the Soviet Union. The mechanical feat of catapulting some more tonnage into space is no recompense for this barbarously bureaucratic conduct, which is then labelled—as it was by Brezhnev in his welcoming speech to the astronauts last Monday—as "socialist democracy"! A hundred years after the abolition of serfdom, the Russian people still are given no say in the decisions of government.

What We Do Abroad Shapes Our Society at Home

All this should not blind us complacently to the epochal changes taking place. Russian predominance in space and the explosion of the first Chinese nuclear bomb punctuate the end of an epoch. The American Century is drawing to a close; it lasted barely two decades. We must adjust for a time, not far distant, in which two other great Powers match us in brute power and soon after that in affluence. We can adjust wisely, setting an example in civilization or foolishly, and perhaps stumble into disaster. Even if major war is avoided, how we act abroad will shape the character of our society at home. The heritage of order and liberty we enjoy can easily be destroyed if we react by building more missiles. The problems of the near future are twofold. One is the delicate "three body problem" which physicists and astronomers have never solved: how to estimate the mutual adjustment between two great powers is difficult enough; among three, it is almost insoluble. The other is rapidly to bring China into the family

How The Vietnamese Feel About Our War

"It was the first light of gray dawn as our armored cavalry swung off the highway and into the flooded paddies. This was a police action. A manhunt. The villages of Phu Le and Tung Cai, secure behind the water that cut them off from Dong Ha and Quang Tri, were to be searched for draft dodgers and deserters. Able-bodied males between 21 and 25, who could not explain their status, would be hauled in for questioning.

"Recently, in this sector, 400 draft notices were mailed out. Seven less-than-able bodied young men, confident they'd be rejected, reported. South of here, in the Delta, whole communities turned on the military when it tried to round up draft dodgers. They surrounded planes and prevented their taking off. At one village they started a riot during which many draft dodgers escaped. Phu Le's draft dodgers had had ample warning. Only five bewildered youths were collared. Under guard they stared straight ahead. The parents of one showed up. The mother was outraged. Later there were tears and entreaties. The boy cried, too. He didn't want to be a soldier."

—Jim Lucas from Vietnam, Wash. Daily News, Oct. 15.

of nations before the nuclear djinn is wholly out of control and every sizeable nation has the power of precipitating holocaust.

In the face of such momentous problems, the President's recent speeches on foreign policy are feeble and inadequate. Nothing better demonstrates the slow drift of our politics from reality than the general agreement, shared even by Miller with Humphrey, that we ought to invite China to sign the nuclear test ban—but without granting recognition! When we see how the whole world is shaken by a bomb in China, a succession in Moscow, or the possibility of an irresponsible like Goldwater entering the White House, we see how obsolete are the divisions among nations. All mankind has an urgent interest, and should have some voice, in these no longer distant decisions. The No. 1 item on the planetary agenda is now some federal form of world government or ultimately world catastrophe.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy Of This Issue To Friends If You Send Stamped Self-Addressed Envelopes

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone State

10/26/64

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone State

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July and August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.